DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 180 856 SO 012 169

AUTHOR Shermis, S. Samuel: Barth, James L.
TITLE Social Studies Teachers and Liberal Intellectual Journals: Helping Teachers in the Problem-Solving Process.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 18p.: Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies (Portland, OR, November 21, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Problems: Intellectualization: *Periodicals: *Problem Solving: Questioning Techniques: Reading Materials: Relevance (Education): Secondary Education: Social Problems: *Social Studies: Teacher Education: *Teacher Motivation

ABSTRACT

Despite the endorsement of problem solving by social studies educators as an important process for students to learn, research shows that most social studies teachers do not include such higher level intellectual processes in their teaching. This paper specifically deplores the lack of attention to inquiry problems. The authors suggest that social studies teachers have not adequately sensed that problems exist in the social milieu that relate to students' lives. It is necessary to sensitize teachers of social studies to the nuances of social problems and to make them more discerning about social problems as conflicts between moral values. One way to accomplish this would be to encourage teachers to read past and current issues of liberal intellectual journals such as "Saturday Review," "Atlantic," "Nation," and "New Republic." Their literary style, wide ranging concerns, and complexity of analysis could serve to promote an awareness of the presence of social problems. The journals' alarmist tones may in reality be exaggerated, but they will stimulate readers to sense that there are problem situations in the world. Also, by reading past issues teachers will see that many present problems which appear to be unique were actually apparent in past decades as well. If teachers read these journals and realize the true dimensions of social problems, perhaps they will be inspired to lead their students in identifying and exploring problems also. (AV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
James L. Barth
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED180856

SO 012 169

SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHERS AND LIBERAL INTELLECTUAL JOURNALS: HELPING TEACHERS IN THE PROBLEM-SOLVING PROCESS

by

S. Samuel Shermis, Associate Professor, Purdue University

James L. Barth, Associate Professor, Purdue University

Introduction

The gloomy news about social studies education, as presented by Shaver et. al.[1] in 1978 echoes almost verbatim the findings of Beale in 1936:[2] social studies teachers stay as far away as possible from problem-solving. Indeed, according to two of our own doctoral candidates, Brannen[3] and Allen,[4] social studies teachers display a positive aversion to higher level intellectual processes, and in company with most other teachers, confine their questions to Bloom Level I, rote memory and factual recall.

Why this appears to be the case we have attempted to explain elsewhere.[5] We pointed out the extraordinary paradox: for the past 60 or more years social studies educators have uniformly and without exception endorsed problem-solving, decision-making and the teaching of higher level cognitive processes; and for the same period of time all research without exception reveals the same emphasis on "coverage" of textbook, reward for conformity to teacher beliefs, indoctrination and an absence of problem-solving thought. We have also argued elsewhere[6] that teachers in the social studies have accepted the language and verbalized goals of the social studies, with its emphasis on democracy, citizenship, problem-solving, choice-making, decisions, etc., etc., but seem to have defined the terms in ways entirely different from what was intended. We contended that teachers appear to have internalized a model of the social studies we call Citizenship Transmission. The dominant aim of the Citizenship Transmitter is to persuade students that there are cultural values that must be

accepted for everyday living. Social studies teachers, then, assume that there are certain givens--cultural values--which students are persuaded to believe are altogether good and worthy of being accepted. In the process, the world is simplified, difficulties elided, conflicts avoided, issues ignored and problems and problem-solving, while invariably given lip service, are nowhere to be found.

This unhappy analysis depresses us for it suggests that, given this model, teachers will be unable to study problems in the sense advocated by e.g., John Dewey, Hunt and Metcalf, Johnson, Wesley, Wronski, Engle, Brubaker, Newmann and others whom we have tagged with the label Reflective Inquirers.[7] If, however, this implication is valid and unavoidable, then there is no logical reason for the NCSS to continue and Barth and I are out of a job. We can expect to be haunting employment bureaus and otherwise becoming a burden on the taxpayers. If we believe that all is not necessarily lost and that it is possible for social studies teachers to be trained in problem-solving, then the question becomes, How?

First, of course, there needs to be some consensus--which there is not now--on social studies and the purpose of social studies in preparing future citizens for self-government. This would logically require our organization, the NCSS, to come clear on the philosophical issue of ends and means. It would also, we think, require first, a conception of problem, i.e., inquiry problem, and second, some means by which teachers could sensitize themselves to problems. These two assertions lead us to the body of our paper.

Problem

As we have already indicated, there are at least five different, conceptually unrelated meanings of the term "problem". The one we wish to consider is what we call "inquiry problem."[8] As we all know, perhaps John Dewey's most important contribution to philosophy and education was his analysis of the role of thinking, and especially his analysis of the relationship between

problem-sensing and thought. To summarize briefly, thought begins with the ground of experience as the individual internalizes a problem, that is, as the person suffers some temporary blockage. For some reason, the individual cannot understand, explain or make sense of an event; or what is similar, cannot decide how to feel about something.[9] Hunt and Metcalf, in their important contribution,[10] attempted to relate this insight to the character of social problems. Both insisted that the dichotomous terms "social" and "personal" are inadequate and misleading: in effect, all social problems become individual problems and any individual problem is itself a reflection of a larger social phenomenon. Thus, not only is there the "problem" of inflation but individuals find themselves in increasingly straitened economic circumstances, cannot find the money for rent, medication, food and fuel. And, thus, not only does Carolyn, 20 year old college student, not know how to feel about her nighttime frolics with Homer, but we are all aware that the cultural patterns concerned with sex are weak, unclear and shifting. To repeat: inflation and individual sexual conflicts are both reflections of wider social problems. We suggest that this is a defensible framework for problem-solving in the social studies, for anything that separates the social and the "individual" is inherently self-limiting.

Problem and Social Problem

The relationship between the terms "problem" and "social problem" is not quite as clear as we have suggested in the paragraph above. Indeed, both of us have done little else in the last couple of years but reflect on this relationship.[11] We have benefited greatly from research into the definition of the term "social problem" as it has been used by sociologists since the late 19th Century. What we discovered was that sociologists have evolved in their understanding and use of the concept. In the 19th Century there was no definition and a social problem was whatever anyone cared to label as such. Beginning in the late 1920s and early 1930s, some attempted a

precise definition. At present the emphasis is upon the definer, his assumptions and his methodologies.

We mention this evolution for two reasons. First, our colleague, Michael Lybarger, has unearthed evidence indicating that sociologists had a direct influence on social studies and on a conception of problem-solving. Second, we concluded that the process of defining the term clearly occupied sociologists for many years and we believe that social studies educators could have profited from their labors. But it has seemed to us that our brethren have been blissfully unaware that there was any sort of complexity or issue in the term. Just as "problem-solving," "citizenship," and all other key terms in the lexicon of social studies educators have typically been lift undefined and unclarified, "social problem" has been considered an obvious and self-evidently clear term. This has meant that social problems text writers have been able to package an assortment of fragmented facts and concepts about pot, sex, reds, booze, crime, poverty, etc.,and call this "problem-solving." The atomistic bits were then presented to students who were instructed to regard them as social problems. In effect, then, the entire process of prepackaging information into official subject matter and curriculum persisted but was now officially designated "studying social problems." As students frittered their time away, squirmed, sighed and continued to act as if they didn't care, we wondered how they could be so indifferent when they were studying social problems that affected them.

The second point we wish to make is one that seems to have its origins in the second decade of this century, about the time that the social studies was defined, its essential theoretical propositions articulated, and the parent orgainzation, the NCSS conceived. We refer to the idea of the problem as integrator of knowledge from disparate sources.[12] It has seemed to us that as Dewey and others were conceptualizing problem-solving, they must have recognized that the only way of bringing together, synthesizing, analyzing and

integrating knowledge from so many different sources is the problem. As we examine inter-disciplinary research efforts today, we get a glimpse of what they must have perceived. We are personally aware of moon research teams at Purdue University a decade ago which made use of both researchers and insights from engineering, biology, mathematics, design theory, physics and other disciplines. We see in actuality that what functionally integrates the knowledge and understandings from such diverse fields is the common task, i.e., solving the problem.

Given this conception of problem and social problem, the logical next step is the question, How does one sensitize teachers of social studies to the nuances of social problems? How does one make them aware that all social problems involve deviations from some perceived value and that both the value and the nature and extent of deviation is always at issue? How does one render teachers more discerning about social problems as conflicts between moral values--and not as arenas in which good guys fight bad ones? How does one sharpen teachers' awareness that the behavior about which individuals complain bitterly is virtually never of recent origin, that it has been around in one form or another for many years?

The Function of Liberal Intellectual Journals

The answer to these questions, it has seemed to us, is, Send teachers to a source whose very raison d'être is to signal the emergence of social problems. We refer to liberal intellectual journals.

Style. The style in which liberal intellectual journals are written is part of their charm, although as we shall argue in a moment, it is a seductive charm. As a preliminary observation, it seems unlikely to us that social studies teachers are going to turn in any large number to academic journals of the social sciences. Whatever we may personally feel about journals published by the American Historical Association, the American Anthropological Association, the American Sociological Association and all other academic

fraternities, it is reasonably clear that they are often forbiddingly difficult to read, full of jargon, bristling with statistical tables and replete with qualifications piled upon qualifications. These, of course, are built into the disciplines and properly so but they do not make for attractive reading. On the other hand, pop magazines and newspapers, are usually vulgar, simplistic, designed to sensationalize as much as to inform,and contain--as some of us know from bitter personal experience--massive amounts of misinformation and garbled understanding. The logical alternative, we argue, is the liberal intellectual journal whose reading style is generally lucid and occasionally distinguished.[13] This style has always been polished for there have usually been able and literate persons at the helms of The Saturday Review, The Atlantic, The Nation, The New Republic, Commentary and others whose pages we consulted.

But the rhetoric of the journals is a mixed blessing. As stimulating as rhetoric is, there are particular characteristics that render the style problematic in the sense that the journals appear to be sending a mixed message. Let us expand. Liberal intellectual journals make extensive use of metaphor, irony, hypoerbole and exaggeration of various kinds. Thus, in one typical statement,[14] we learn that ". . . private enterprise in the building trades has completely broken down in New York in providing new housing for the great bulk of the citizens." From another we learn of a ". . . special madness when tensions are escalated between groups who are basically in accord in their opposition to numbers games, but whose legal establishments and 'spokesman' keep the fires fueled."[15] Roosevelt's appeal during the New Deal was "pathetically naive" and his policies ". . . innaugurated an orgy of price fixing and profiteering," from which the nation ". . . got in exchange just about nothing at all."[16] From a 19th Century Nation we see the rhetorical question, "Do [the trials on mail corruption fraud] indicate strongly that the decline in the tone of public life by which we are all so much grieved and alarmed, is

due fully as much to the easy good-nature and one-eyedness of the honest man as the rascality of the knave."[17]

Such exaggeration--chosen from literally hundreds of examples--and spanning a little more than a century--reveals not simply a tendency to overstate or embellish. Rather, as we shall argue, it reveals a tendency to describe social conditions that are believed to be not merely bad but as bad as they can get. Such, we think, is built in to the mentality of the writers.

Wit, Humor, Irony. Too civilized to engage in heavy-handed sarcasm and too intelligent to grind along in solemn and ponderous fashion, many of the writers engage from time to time in stinging wit and irony. For instance, in The New Republic we read of a Massachusetts legislature that made it illegal to demonstrate with a flag that said "No God, No Master." The New Republic comments: "So of course the law-makers made a law. This done, we presume the masters felt relieved; how God felt we don't know."[18] In a Nation article on President Andrew Johnson's pardoning of some convicted mail robbers, the writers suggests that all about to be indicted on a federal offense

> . . . should file their application for pardon before trial. The president can then look into their cases, and perhaps release them without subjecting them to the trouble and mortification of going before a jury.[19]

Complex Analysis, Simple Solutions. It is impossible to illustrate one characteristic of the journals--their tendency to combine complex analysis and fairly simplistic solutions. But even a cursory glance at the journals will reveal that protracted analysis, with historical origins, economic ramifications, political complexities, etc., is the rule rather than the exception. Following the often lengthy analysis one is likely to find solutions that are as short and simple as the analysis is complex. With some frequency--particularly in the 20th Century--the proposed solution was the passage of a federal law, moral regeneration of the souls of the judiciary or the executive or widespread public awareness of failure and ethical lapses. One example of a

simplistic conclusion is necessary. This one is from Commentary and concerns the tangled issue affirmative action.[20]

> It is hard to say how widely such pernicious practices have been institutionalized in other colleges and universities. But were they to be generalized across the nation, one thing will be certain: either large numbers of highly-qualified scholars will pay with their careers simply because they are male and white, or affirmative action will have failed in its benevolent purpose.

The "pernicious practices" relate to quotas and statistical guidelines for minorities and women. Since the article was written (1972) these practices have, in fact, been widely--although certainly not universally--instituted throughout the country. It is hardly clear that the "benevolent purposes" of affirmative action have failed and it is equally unclear that "large numbers" of white male scholars have paid with their careers.

View of the Apocalypse. Given the previous observation on exaggeration, hyperbole, either/or orientations, complex analysis and simplistic conclusions, it is fitting to end this description with comments about the apocalyptic and prophetic nature of the journals. By "apocalyptic" we refer not to the original meaning of a revelation depicting the ultimate triumph of good over evil but rather to the feeling of impending destruction.

Many of the journal articles and editorials[21] are infused with the imminance of chaos, destruction or extreme peril. In one editorial from The Saturday Review written just after World War II, the writer pillories the United States for dithering, debating and remaining indifferent to the starvation, disorganization, violence, political instability, etc., of post-War Europe. In fact, within a short while after the editorial was written, our country had embarked on the Marshall Plan and other massive efforts to aid war-torn Europe.

During the Teapot Dome era, one sees comments like this editorial:[23]

> History will record that during this period public resources of great value were abandoned to private interests: that this was accompanied by the most shameless purchase of high officials and that during the time one of the most important government depart-

> ments was the familiar meeting place of a nest of incredibly vulgar and sordid rascals engaging in bootlegging, drug-smuggling, criminal conspiracy, and the giving and accepting of bribes. That stain is indelible.

No one has ever maintained that politics during the Harding presidency were anything but sleazy. But the tone of the quotation is one of unrelieved anger--with the underlying sense that, as we have already said, things are about as bad as they can get. We remind our readers that the stain after Teapot Dome did not prove indelible nor has it so proven five years after Watergate.

Anyone wishing to argue that we ought not therefore take liberal intellectual claims more seriously than advertising because both are fraught with exaggeration is missing the point. The apocalyptic views of the authors are to be taken seriously not because they are self-evidently valid but because they tell us something about the events described, about the perception of liberal intellectual writers and a good deal more about the perception of social problems in our culture. Whether lamenting the imminent demise of religion in the 1870s, the Decline-of-Rome political morality of the 1880s, the certain degeneration of racial relations since 1866, the immediate degradation of the environment or the deteriorating state of the Yale-Harvard rowing match, liberal intellectuals tend to write as if society were on the verge of extinction. Whatever may be true of the objective realities of a given situation--which are probably not capable of being known with certainty--liberals tend to perceive the world as if in imminent danger of being engulfed by a destructive flood. The reason for this perception, we should now like to argue, is related to the prophetic nature and function of the journals.

Prophecy and Prophets

In the monograph which we used for the basis of this paper, we maintained that liberal intellectual journal writers seem to have claimed for themselves the same right arrogated several thousand years ago by Biblical prophets. The prophets, we learned from a number of traditional sources,[24] considered them-

selves spokesmen for the Deity, charged by Him with alerting the people of Israel to their many transgressions against morality, justice and ethical norms. As opposed to Greek philosophers who were often absorbed with issues of transcendental importance--metaphysics, ultimate knowledge, the source of belief--the Hebrew prophets were concerned with questions of morality, right and wrong, with justice and literally affairs of the marketplace and the courtroom.

We were struck by the clear parallels between the writings and concerns of the Biblical prophets and those of the liberal journals. The writers' concern for police behavior, legislators, presidents, landlords, corporation owners, for those who abuse authority, for those who do not "inspect or direct," is directly comparable to the prophet's hatred of the "corruption of judges." And this concern--infused with the feeling that it is their absolute responsibility to warn the uncaring and heedless populace--that is the matrix of the mixed blessing, the seductive charm, about which we spoke at the beginning of this paper.

What are Liberal Intellectual Journals For?

On the one hand, the liberal intellectual journals are inherently stimulating, readable, entertaining, edifying and whatever other synonym one has for words which mean "simultaneously provoke and instruct." On the other hand, they mix complex analysis with often simplistic conclusions. They are frequently undiscriminating, treating the ethical lapses of competitive athletes, exploition of Blacks, international catastrophes, etc., etc., as if all were dangerous and equally perilous. One finds the abuses of radio advertisers, the destruction of fish and wildlife, the barbaric behavior of Korean militarists, the evasions of corporate spokesmen all treated with the identical vituperative language. But, as one authority on the prophets remarked, the prophets themselves knew of no difference among transgressions; any transgression was equally a departure and all departures from God-given morality were equally dangerous to Israel's soul.

It is these characteristics which make the reading of liberal intellectual journals both absorbing and bewildering. Nevertheless, when we finished our examination of a half dozen journals--one of which has appeared regularly since it published essays by Thoreau and Emerson in the early 19th Century--we concluded that their major function makes them extremely useful to social studies teachers. What is that function? Why are they useful?

Function. When one begins a historical survey, reading issues that appeared 10, 50, 75 or 100 years ago, one immediately recalls the French cliché: Plus qu'ils changent, plus qu'ils restent la même--the more things change, the more they stay the same. Wherever we looked we discovered that the problem was not new. The Nation was waxing indignant about mistreatment of the Indians long before the 20th Century dawned. The New Republic was concerned with alienation of workers in the second decade of the Century. All journals have bemoaned the tastelessness, violence and grinding vulgarity of radio, alleging precisely the same things that are alleged of television today. Racial justice was for The Nation an issue months after the Civil War ended. The Nation anguished over destruction of gamebirds and animals for nothing more than furs and feathers to supply the fashion industry--and this a full century before ecologists made this a popular concern. The need for international control, law and order was an issue before the United Nations, before the League of Nations--before even the Spanish American Was was fought. We could adduce a volume of evidence to support the claim that what we identify as a social problem today was so identified decades ago. What we concluded was not that the problem was there all along. Rather--because of what we had learned about the sociologists' definition of social problem--we concluded that the behavior was there all along. What we were seeing in the writings of liberal intellectuals was an attempt on the part of latter-day prophets to persuade their readership that an important social problem exists. It is this attempt to persuade which results in the hyperbole, exaggeration and prophetic anger that we found so

abundant. The reason for the anger is clear: one does not warn against a fire by softly murmuring "Everybody leave." Rather one screams. Liberal writers do not greatly reprimand or remind or warn. They are strident, angry and indignant.

Use. Despite our misgivings, despite our ambivalence, we were persuaded that liberal intellectual journals could conceivably perform an extremely useful function. We thought that their literary style, wide-ranging concerns and complexity of analysis could function to sensitize teachers to the shape and meaning of social problems. If--as we have argued in a number of places--the problem-solving process does not begin unless and until a problem is sensed,[25] what is needed is whatever it takes to generate a sense of problem.

And if a problem is, as Dewey thought, a blockage to an ongoing process, the problem generator is something that blocks, that arrests, that causes an individual to generate a sense of value conflict or a sense that his cognitive structure cannot explain a phenomenon. Or it is something that poses as a barrier to action; that is, one does not know what to do, what course of action to take. We have concluded that all problems are essentially compounds of these three: the inability to comprehend, to know how to feel or to know how to act. Thus, whatever form a problem takes, we argue that the careful and persistent reading of liberal intellectual journals could well have the effect of generating confusion, blockages or conflicts. In particular, reading of two or more journals, with all of the conflicts inherent in different editorial positions, could generate the desired awareness.

At this point, we'll need to backtrack to identify one characteristic of the term "liberal," recognizing that the word requires several pages in the Oxford English Dictionary to explain. Whatever else liberals share in common, their most distinguishing feature, we think, is their differences. In the past and today liberals differ almost as much among themselves as they do from

conservatives, radicals, reactionaries or whatever inadequate term one can invent to describe political, economic and social philosophies. At this moment there is very little that liberals believe in common about matters of racial, religious or ethnic conflict--outside of the need for racial justice and this of course is hardly enough to unify a position. Liberals believe that affirmative action with its attendant quotas is essential, that it is unConstitutional, and that it is a reasonable and fair attempt to remedy past injustices. With regard to civil rights in another arena, liberals believe that gag rules imposed by judges are an abridgement of the press's freedom and that they are essential at times to protect the citizens' right to a fair trial. Liberals believe that Israel is an intransigent enclave of self-righteous militarism, unable to compromise or even accord Palestinians elementary rights andthat the Israelis are victims of a combination of old fashion anti-Semitism and Arab oil sheiks who have an irrational compulsion to exterminate them, just as a previous generation of Jew haters ended their presence forever in Eastern Europe. One could provide many other examples of conflict and disagreement within the liberal press, but perhaps we have made our point: the conflicts inherent in liberal intellectual journals, read by readers with an adequate informational background, should generate a sense that there is a serious departure from a cherished value. Whoever thinks about the departure will soon conclude that there is abundant conflict about a.) the nature of the value that is in danger and b.) the nature of the departure. And this is good. For it is such conflict which gives rise to the sense of unease, confusion and ambivalence that always accompanies the internalization of a problem.

Conclusion

In short, then, to teach social studies teachers the process of problem-solving, it is essential that they be rendered sensitive to the first stage of the complete act of thought, to use Dewey's words. This is the internaliza-

tion of the problem. For this to happen, teachers must possess a model of the problem-solving process which does not separate the personal and the social. And, finally, teachers must be exposed to a source that does not merely inform but more important generates a sense of conflict. For this task, we nominate the reading of liberal intellectual journals.

FOOTNOTES

[1]James P. Shaver, O. L. Davis, Jr., and Suzanne W. Helburn. "The Status of Social Studies Education: Impressions from Three NSF Studies," Social Education 43 (February, 1979) 150-153.

[2]Howard K. Beale. Are American Teachers Free? An Analysis of Restraints Upon the Freedom of Teaching in American Schools. Report of the Commission of the Social Studies, Part XII of the American Historical Association, Investigation of the Social Studies in the Schools. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936) Reprinted by New York: Octagon Books, 1972.

[3]Buster Duke Brannen, "Investigation of the Inquiry Questioning Strategies Used by Secondary Social Studies Teachers," a PhD dissertation, Purdue University, 1973. Some quotations from this study, in a section entitled Cognitive Levels of Classroom Questioning, include: "Numerous studies have focused on the cognitive level of the teacher's classroom questions. The studies consistently show that memory level questions dominate the classroom." "More recent studies continue to show that memory level questions dominate the classroom." Both quotations are on pps. 28-29.

[4]John Phillip Allen, "A Study to Compare the Conceptual Systems and Questioning Behavior of Preservice Teachers in Social Studies Methods Courses," a PhD dissertation, Purdue University, 1979. Some representative quotations from a section entitled Social Studies Teachers' Questioning Patterns: "Dodl concluded that the teachers dominated classroom dialogue, asked most of the questions, and asked mostly low level questions. Schrieber and Crump report the same results; most teacher questions were pitched at memory level." "There is a general absence of questions designed to stimulate the intellectual processes that one associates with the goals of social studies . . ." See pps. 12, 15.

[5]This contention is described at length in Robert Barr, James L. Barth and S. Samuel Shermis, Defining the Social Studies. Bulletin 51. Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1977.

[6]Ibid. See also Shermis and Barth, "Defining Social Problems," Theory and Research in Social Education, VII (Spring, 1979) 1-19.

[7]However, if one were to ask social studies teachers, "Are you and your class studying problems?" the answer would likely be "Yes, we are. The other day we studies the problem that Roosevelt faced in 1933." When teachers affirm that they advocate the study of problems or that they favor "the problem-solving approach," it is unclear precisely what is signified. The authors concluded that there are at least five different, conceptually unrelated meanings for the word "problem" and that this generates confusion. See Shermis and Barth, "We All Know What a Problem Is. Don't We?" Peabody Journal of Education 55 (April, 1978) 287-297.

[8]Shermis and Barth, "We All Know What A Problem Is. Don't We?" op. cit..

[9]In Dewey's How We Think. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1910, revised in 1933, and his more technical Logic The Theory of Inquiry New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1939.

[10]Maurice P. Hunt and Lawrence Metcalf, Teaching High School Social Studies. New York: Harper and Row, Second Edition, 1968.

[11]"What is a Social Problem? How Do Sociologists Define the Term?" an unpublished manuscript, Purdue University, 54 pp.

[12]We make this point in two of our recent works. See "Defining Social Problems." op. cit., and an as yet unpublished chapter, "The Goals of Social Studies: The 20th Century Perspective," in a work that is now being compiled and edited by Professor Charles Berryman, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia. We also touched upon integration in an interview with Professor Edgar Wesley in "Social Studies and the Problem of Knowledge; A Re-examination of Edgar Bruce Wesley's Classic Definition of Social Studies," Theory and Research in Social Education, VI (March, 1978) 31-43.

[13]Shermis and Barth, "Liberal Intellectual Journals and the Perception of Social Problems," an unpublished monograph, Purdue University, W. Lafayette, Indiana, 1978. Much of this paper comes from this source. We discovered that from 20 to about 100 years ago, writers whose names are household terms--Mark Twain, John Steinbeck, Ernest Hemmingway, et. al.,--wrote either regularly or intermittently for the journals.

[14]From an editorial by Bruce Bliven, The New Republic, 38 (March 5, 1924) 40.

[15]Thomas Sowell, "Are Quotas Good for Blacks?" Commentary 65 (June, 1978) 39, 43.

[16]"No Santa Claus," The New Republic 79 (May 16, 1934) 12.

[17]The Nation 22 (January 6, 1876) 1.

[18]The New Republic 1 (November 14, 1914) 5.

[19]The Nation 2 (March 15, 1866) 322.

[20]Paul Seabury, "HEW and the Universities," Commentary 53 (February, 1972) 44.

[21]We need to make an observation about the editoralizing proclivities of the journal writers and publishers. Among newspaper editors it is usually considered bad form to mix the opinion/evaluation process with the objective/news reporting function. Since the early 19th Century, liberal intellectual journals have tended to ignore the distinction, often mixing equal measures of judgment and "straight" reporting. Thus, by contrast with newspapers, which are supposed to keep editorializing confined to the editorial page, intellectual journals tend to intersperse judgments throughout their news reports.

[22]Amy Loveman, Saturday Review 29 (May 4, 1946) 18.

[23]The New Republic 38 (April 2, 1924) 134.

[24]E.g., see "Prophets and Prophecy," in R. J. Zwi Werblowsky and Geoffrey Wigoder, Editors, The Encyclopedia of the Jewish Religion. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965; Supremacy of Morality in "Prophets and Prophecy" in Encyclopedia Judaica. Jerusalem: The Macmillan Company, 1971, Volume 13; Abraham J. Heschel. The Prophets An Introduction. New York: Harper and Row, 1962. In this last work, there is a direct and abundant discussion of widows, orphans, corruption of judges and evils of the marketplace. At the risk of being redundant we point out that the prophets concern for affairs of the marketplace and the courtroom are not metaphors for something else; they were concerned with the marketplace and courtroom.

[25]This, as we see it, is the essential distinction between what we call "problem exercises" and "inquiry problems." See our article "We All Know What a Social Problem Is. Don't We?" op. cit.